


Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07/05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		ITL.0248US (P7373)	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 101.11(a)].  on <u>April 10, 2006</u>  Signature <u>Cynthia L. Hayden</u>  Typed or printed name <u>Cynthia L. Hayden</u>		Application Number	Filed
		09/466,113	December 17, 1999
		First Named Inventor	
		James P. Ketrenos	
		Art Unit	Examiner
		2145	Adnan Mirza
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided:			
I am the			
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.			
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>28,994</u>			
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____			
		 Signature	
		<u>Timothy N. Trop</u> Typed or printed name	
		<u>(713) 468-8880</u> Telephone number	
		<u>April 10, 2006</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			

☒ \*Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: James P. Ketrenos et al.

James P. Ketrenos et al.

Serial No.: 09/466,113

Filed: December 17, 1999

For: Distributed File System  
Including Multicast Retrieval

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Art Unit: 2145

Examiner: Adnan Mirza

Atty Docket: ITL.0248US  
P7373

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF  
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Sir:

Claim 1 calls for identifying whether a portion of a file system received by the client is stored in a first location associated with portions of the file system that have previously been stored by the client or whether that portion is stored in a second location associated with portions of a file system that were streamed to the client by a server.

At a minimum then, the cited references must teach a system which stores portions of a file system streamed to the client in one location and portions that have been previously stored in another location. Secondly, the reference must teach identifying which of these two situations applies to a given stored portion.

Neither of the above items is described in any of the cited references. Stakutis is apparently cited for teaching of receiving a request for a portion of a file system by a client. It is

Date of Deposit: April 10, 2006  
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.  
*Cynthia L. Hayden*  
Cynthia L. Hayden

conceded that Stakutis does not teach identifying whether the portion is stored in a first or a second location. It is apparently conceded that Wlaschin also does not teach this.

In the final rejection, the following assertions were made which do not seem to meet the scope of the claimed invention:

1. “Stakutis disclosed, ‘It is preferable to know exactly each file is laid out on the shared peripheral device, e.g., disk.’” Response to Arguments, paragraph 15, page 5. However, nothing is cited to explain where this comes from. Moreover, even if it is preferable to know how every file is laid out, this has nothing to do with file systems and nothing to do with determining whether a portion of a file system is stored in a location associated with file systems that have been previously stored at a location or a location that stores portions that were streamed. It does not even teach the concept of storing streamed and previously stored portions in differently identifiable locations. It simply does not meet the scope of the claimed invention.

2. “Application programs make requests based on logical file blocks. The file system present to an application abstraction of a file that appears to be a series of contiguous blocks. In reality the file system allocates physical pieces of the disk drive separately and knits them together in a variety of file system specific trees and directories and maps (and other structures). While a logical-block x might reside on a physical block y, the block x+1 might live in an entirely different area.” Citing column 6, lines 50-60. Again, this is interesting, but it does not seem to have any bearing on subject matter within the claimed scope. It does not teach what is claimed, it just teaches how file systems allocate data. It does not teach the specific allocation of data and the specific identifications set forth in the claim.

As a result, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out. For example, the fact that Stakutis does or does not like to know where each file is laid out is a teaching of the general, not as specific as what is claimed. The general proposition that you would like to know where the files are does not teach identifying whether a portion of a file system is stored in one place or another, and it does not teach storing the file system in one place when it is previously stored in another place when it has been streamed. The general teaching cannot meet the specific claimed limitations.

Therefore, reconsideration would be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Timothy N. Trop', is written over a horizontal line.

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation